INDIANA JUDICIAL TECHNOLOGY AND AUTOMATION PROJECT

Introduction and Overview

Indiana courts and court clerks handle more than 1.5 million cases per year, ranging from capital murder and multi-million dollar corporate lawsuits to divorces, minor traffic infractions and rent disputes. Meticulous records of the filing, progress, and outcome of these cases are essential to their prompt and fair resolution. And the information in these case records is vital to law enforcement and other government agencies, to other courts, to lawyers, and to the public.

Modern information technology, networking and automation can dramatically improve the service that the people of Indiana receive from their courts. For this reason, the Indiana Supreme Court respectfully requests that the General Assembly appropriate $11.82 million for the FY 2001-2003 biennium ($4.55 million in FY 2002 and $7.27 million in FY 2003) to implement the "Judicial Technology and Automation Project" described in this request. This request, if funded, will:

- Allow Indiana trial courts and court clerks to manage their caseloads faster and more cost-effectively.

- Provide users of Indiana trial court information, notably law enforcement agencies, state policy makers and the public with more timely, accurate, and comprehensive information.

- Reduce the cost of trial court operations borne by Indiana counties.

- Examine the feasibility of implementing important technological innovations in Indiana trial courts.

Implementing the AIMS Project

Of the total amount requested, $ 10.78 million is allocated to implement the "AIMS Project," the Supreme Court's ongoing program of developing 21st century case management systems for Indiana's courts and court clerks.

"Case management systems" are the combination of computer hardware and software that create and manage court records, including those maintained by the courts' clerks. Since 1995, the Supreme Court has been engaged in a major effort to develop standards for trial court case management systems. This effort is called AIMS (Automated Information Management System). Andersen Consulting assisted in the initial phases of AIMS and helped provide a foundation for further AIMS progress.

The AIMS Project was initially conceived to provide a model and framework for Indiana court management systems by establishing:

- Minimum hardware and functionality requirements for court case management systems;

- Means for connecting trial court case management systems with the Supreme Court's Division of State Court Administration and with other state agencies and public entities that use court data, including the public; and

- A Windows-based case management application design as a model for future software development.

The AIMS philosophy is to use current and emerging information technology to the fullest while providing strong management and judicial controls over the process and the records generated by it. The information made available to non-court users principally will be case status and disposition information, maintained and updated in a rather detailed fashion. The information maintained at the local court level also includes transactional data – that is, data maintained at a level of detail sufficient to provide an audit trail of the progress of each matter in the system.

Under the auspices of the AIMS project, detailed standards for trial court case management systems have been developed and substantial progress has been made in addressing the sharing of information with non-court users. In this request, the Supreme Court seeks funding during the 2001-2003 biennium to both interface with and upgrade existing or "legacy" case management systems to "AIMS standards" and/or to install "AIMS compliant" case management systems in all Indiana trial courts and court clerk offices. As described more fully in Part I below, these standards focus on:

- Case management system characteristics. These characteristics are the technical and functional features of the case management systems that will ultimately be available to and required in every trial court and trial court clerk's office.

- Data exchange. In order for other courts and for non-court users to use the information contained in any particular court's case management system, the data must be entered and maintained in a way that permits exchange among users. This section describes the AIMS requirements for data exchange and also describes data exchange with three key users – the Bureau of Motor Vehicles, the Indiana State Police Criminal Justice Data Division, and the State's prosecuting attorneys in each county.
- Connectivity architecture. In order for data exchange to occur, the hardware and software connection among and between court case management systems and non-court users must be established and standardized.

- Central Judicial Data Repository or "Warehouse". Certain information collected at the trial court level will be collected and maintained at a central location to permit queries by court and noncourt users, as well as management analysis and research.

Exploring Innovations in Court Information Technology and Implementing those that Work

In this request, the Supreme Court also seeks $1.04 million in aggregate funding for the FY 2001-2003 biennium to support pilot projects in a variety of innovative court technologies. These pilot projects would support exploration of:

- "Paperless courts" – courts in which all filings, notices, and other items which now exist as physical documents are instead created, transmitted, used, and stored electronically.
- "Video courts" – courts in which individuals can participate in proceedings from remote locations.
- Voice recognition technology – use of voice recognition technology for creating court records.
- Other emerging technology

Summary of Funding Requested

		FY2002	FY2003	TOTAL
Implementing the AIMS Project				
New case management system installations		2,228,983	2,926,339	5,155,322
Data warehouse and interface development		965,652	2,144,477	3,110,129
High-speed statewide internet connections		410,000	610,000	1,020,000
Public access and information		200,168	217,864	418,032
Access to online legal research resources		301,000	500,000	801,000
Education, training, and office expense		126,600	151,300	277,900
	Subtotal	**4,232,403**	**6,549,980**	**10,782,383**
Exploring Emerging Court Information Technology				
Paperless Courts		75,000	165,000	240,000
Video Courts		40,000	160,000	200,000
Voice Recognition		40,000	160,000	200,000
Contingency Fund for Emerging Technology		160,000	240,000	400,000
	Subtotal	**315,000**	**725,000**	**1,040,000**
	Total	**4,547,403**	**7,274,980**	**11,822,383**

Part I: Implementing the AIMS Project

The Supreme Court seeks $ 10.78 million in aggregate funding during the 2001-2003 biennium to develop and network case management systems meeting the AIMS standards in all Indiana trial courts and court clerk offices. AIMS-compliant court management systems should be installed as soon as feasible in courts and court clerk offices that do not yet have them, and legacy systems should be interfaced and upgraded as appropriate in all courts and court clerk offices which already have operational case management systems. These actions must take place in a partnership between state and county governments.

A. Case Management System Characteristics

In accordance with the AIMS standards, these case management systems would have the following characteristics:

1. The case management systems will have a convenient user interface. The software packages will present a suitable mix of options for user data entry, retrieval, and modification, designed to provide various classes of users with the most effective access to the information they require. In addition to permitting data entry, the interface will present internal system data for review and action by court staff and permit management data entry and retrieval by judges, probation officers, etc., who are not production users but who are familiar with the system and its data content. The interface will also provide: (a) controlled local and remote access to case data, judgment information, etc., to police, private attorneys, victim advocates, CASA, judgment searchers, and others who understand the judicial environment and who are competent computer users; and (b) basic data to walk-in members of the public such as the day's schedule of cases to be heard and location.

2. Data in the case management systems must be up to date to be useful. Data entry (by scanning, bar coding, or key entry) will occur at the source of the data or at its first point of handling in the court system. All data must be processed into the system and database as it is received; the system will not rely on paper recording of data for later key entry.

3. To help assure data integrity, all case management software will utilize a full-featured relational database management system (RDBMS).

4. There will be multiple ways for users to access and use the data in the case management system, including the normal entry and processing of data through the software application, with inquiry and report production being the principal means of viewing the data. In addition, the RDBMS should enable the user to search, find, extract, and report data in other ways such as through an imbedded report generator function, delimited ASCII output files for transfer of sets of data to other software programs, search and find/replace functionality, and data base extracts and subsets for special needs.

5. Basic case management tracking and management tools and reports will include case initiation, scheduling, status flagging, and disposition, all recorded in order that deviations from the norms of the standard case management process are identified for review through data staging. Some examples of the automatic monitoring that will be provided include:

- In criminal cases, at the initial hearing, establishing Criminal Rule 4 (criminal speedy trial rule) effective date, showing the later of the date of filing criminal charges or the date of arrest on the charges.

- In civil cases, permitting the judge to schedule a date and time for Trial Rule 41(E) (civil speedy trial rule) hearings and calls for a second run that generates notices for the remaining flagged cases, setting them for hearing at a designated date and time.

- In probate cases, providing tickler dates for filing and report deadlines for estates, guardianships, trusts, competency cases, etc.

- For more complex cases with many parties and issues, permitting the judge and others to establish a dispositional plan, including scheduled dates for submissions, hearings, status reviews, etc.

6. The case management systems will maintain each court's Record of Judgments and Orders (RJO) and the Chronological Case Summary (CCS).

The RJO and CCS are the central and essential records of judicial process and action. The RJO is maintained as a repository of dispositive orders, judgments, and other important actions of the court, organized as a daily record. It contains the full, verbatim compilation of applicable documents and is organized as a compilation of documents. Typically, due to the inclusion of non-digital documents, the contents of the RJO are not available "online" except where a comprehensive imaging implementation has been accomplished. The CCS, organized by case, is the principal online working reference to the status and progress of each individual case, showing all judicial events and including notations of entries made to the RJO. The CCS as an active record is not fully effective without communication of its entries with the parties to cases and other interested and involved individuals and agencies.

Therefore, maintenance of the CCS and associated notice processing are essential – perhaps the essential – requirements of the case management systems.

7. The case management systems will have direct access to court clerks' financial accounting records. It is mandatory that certain financial data appear in the CCS. Beyond that requirement, it is highly desirable that courts have access to Clerk's financial accounting records for all financial data associated with the cases under the jurisdiction of the court. The greater the integration of data and function with the Clerk's financial accounting, the better the system will serve all of its constituents and users.

8. The case management systems will interface with the sheriff's, prosecutor's office, probation department, and any juvenile facility.

Whether the probation department is supported by the same judicial processing system as the courts or not, the courts should be provided access to the roster of probationers, along with a summary of their terms of probation and current status, including status of probation fees and restitution account.

The courts require data concerning the status of warrants, recalls of warrants, body attachments, protective orders, jail census and history, prosecutor's diversion and bad check program participants, and juvenile facility lists. The point is to provide full information on parties involved in judicial matters to assist the court in its adjudicatory and dispositional actions.

9. The case management systems will provide computer assisted case scheduling.

10. Traffic cases can be processed through the standard case management system facilities. However, due to volume experienced in many jurisdictions, there will be special features for the management of such cases, including close coordination with the receipting and accounting functions of the court clerk.

11. The case management systems will also provide streamlined processing for small claims cases.

12. The case management systems will support expungement and sealing of records. They will provide (a) a method for removing an electronic judicial record such that it and all identifying references to it will no longer be available to anyone using the case management system; and (b) a secure method of sealing and retaining electronic judicial records such that they will no longer be physically or electronically available to inquirers other than by order of a judge having jurisdiction over the records.

The intention is to retain the competitive software and services marketplace, but with the enforcement of standards for court management software and for the exchange of data among the courts, the Division of State Court Administration, and other judicial-related agencies and entities.

B. Data Exchange

In addition to providing each trial court with a tool for managing its cases more promptly and fairly, the information maintained in an individual court's case management system is often extremely important to other courts and to non-court users. Data in each court's system must be accessible to other users of Indiana trial court information in order to provide those users, notably law enforcement agencies and state policy makers, with more timely, accurate, and comprehensive information. Section C below – "Connectivity Architecture" – addresses the architecture or infrastructure necessary for the physical accomplishment of the specified data exchange operations.

1. County Level Data Exchange. At the county level, procedures to facilitate data use by and exchange with non-court users will be implemented. These users will include the following:

a. Lawyers and litigants in civil cases;
b. Prosecutors and criminal defense lawyers;
c. Sheriff's department and other local law enforcement agencies;
d. Child Protection Service and other Family and Social Service Administration caseworkers; and
e. The general public.

2. Statewide Data Exchange – Statistical Reports. To facilitate the preparation of statewide statistical reports from each of the courts of the state, a standardized electronic collection and entry procedure will be implemented and required for system certification. This procedure will generate the necessary statistical data at an appropriate level of detail in a standard format.

While statistical report data is gathered for specific administrative purposes, the establishment of a judicial case data repository or "warehouse" is intended to provide not only a base for inquiry but also a means of "data mining" for research and analysis purposes. This repository or warehouse – described in Section D, "Central Judicial Data Repository" – will not substitute for the detailed case data maintained in the local court system records, but it will provide a consistent set of case data on a statewide basis.

The greater amount and detail of case data in the repository must be accompanied by a greater level of control and security to ensure that the information is used only for proper purposes and by authorized persons.

3. Statewide Data Exchange with and among Related, Noncourt Users. Availability of a network infrastructure and uniform procedures for preparation and forwarding of case data to the central repository will encourage other judicial-related data exchanges. "Hosting" or enabling such data transfers will help local courts discharge their statutory duties and will strengthen the community of judicial systems users for the benefit of all. Furthermore, the related uses provide greater justification for the implementation of a robust networking infrastructure as discussed in Section C. Users with which specific data exchanges are contemplated include the following:

- Bureau of Motor Vehicles CATS (Court Abstract Transmission System).

  AIMS case management systems will enable trial courts or their clerks to forward SR16 abstract-of-judgment data to BMV central records. The forwarding of DWI probable cause data could be added to the procedure if found necessary. This "CATS" procedure is currently used by several counties with dial-up data transfers.

  The forwarding of this data benefits the trial courts by providing a more current and complete traffic violations database for reference in the adjudication of

subsequent cases. Presuming that the BMV also provides access to the information it maintains, the courts also will benefit by gaining access to BMV searchable databases of violations and points standards and of other reference materials.

The CATS data will be a component of the standard case downloads from trial courts to the Central Judicial Data Repository. Then the data of interest to BMV will be extracted and forwarded to BMV. This procedure will ensure that there is always a case in the data repository corresponding to the data sent to BMV.

To maintain the CATS data flow as circumstances change, a liaison between the Division of State Court Administration and the BMV will be established. There will be ongoing dialog between the CATS program coordinator and a Division of State Court Administration representative so that changes in data specifications and coding may be implemented in a timely manner.

Indiana Code § 9-25-6 places certain additional reporting requirements on the courts to forward to BMV (1) abstract of judgment data for alcohol and drug program data in a criminal or delinquency case and (2) court ordered suspensions of drivers licenses for delinquent child support payments. These reports are more susceptible to forwarding in the same general manner as the criminal case dispositions discussed in the following section, with routing to BMV rather than to the Indiana State Police Data Division. The BMV can then take appropriate action.

- Indiana State Police Criminal Justice Data Division.

  Indiana Code § 10-1-2.5-3 requires that trial courts, generally through the trial court clerk's office or with assistance of the county prosecutor, forward criminal case disposition data to the Indiana State Police Criminal Justice Data Division. The data is to be collected for felonies and Class A misdemeanors. This data generally has not been forwarded in digital form – rather, it typically has been forwarded in the form of an annotated fingerprint card, although there is not a general standard procedure in practical use. The critical data includes: cause number, Defendant's name Defendant's date of birth, original charge, final amended charge, disposition and sentence (if found guilty) in quantitative terms.

  This data is less akin to the digital AIMS and CATS data in that it comes less directly from the trial courts and may be in any manner of format, frequently in image form rather than in data record form. This data will be forwarded using the AIMS data communications infrastructure but will be routed directly from the source to the Criminal Justice Data Division, at least initially. This procedure may be revisited during the system design process.

- ProsLink system sponsored by the Indiana Prosecuting Attorneys Council.

  The ProsLink system has been sponsored for a number of years by the Indiana Prosecuting Attorneys Council, with partial funding provided by the Indiana

Criminal Justice Institute. The system provides local prosecutors with case management support and also operates as a statewide facility for shared information.

There are two modes of data exchange involved with ProsLink:

1. Local data exchange, in which the court case management system exports data to establish or update the prosecutor's ProsLink case records. Implementation of the trial court case management system upload procedures will likely facilitate this exchange, provided that ProsLink modifies its procedures accordingly.

2. Statewide data sharing, using the data communications links described in Section C to support statewide access to ProsLink's central database and its data exchange process. The network infrastructure and services have the potential of replacing ProsLink's current dial-up procedures.

C. Connectivity Infrastructure

The AIMS Project will move as rapidly as possible into wide area networking to serve the dispersed judiciary of the state and to aggregate the data from those courts into a central repository.

1. General Network Requirements:

A full-time, managed statewide means of network communication is essential to accomplishing two main operational objectives of the Judicial Technology and Automation Project:

1. Acquisition of trial court statistical and case data with subsequent forwarding to a central repository at the Division of State Court Administration; and

2. Knitting together the courts of the state together with the Division of State Court Administration and other judicial-oriented agencies and organizations to operate as a mutually supportive judicial community.

The Supreme Court, under the auspices of its Judicial Technology and Automation Committee (J-TAC), is currently moving to assure that all Indiana trial courts and court clerks, whether or not they are supported by a computerized case management system, have access to e-mail and to the Internet. That is, J-TAC will ensure that in the near future every court and court clerk has at least one PC connected to e-mail and the Internet in order to have the ability to participate to the greatest extent possible as the statewide judicial network develops. Early connection should encourage courts to move forward with local data initiatives as well.

In the longer term, the statewide network structure will have the following characteristics:

- Ease of use – by any authorized judicial staff member, not requiring data processing department intervention.

- Full time availability – authorized users may make use of the connectivity resources at any time and at any place with proper security. Principal use is to be from trial court and court clerk office locations, but supplementary access (including dial-in) must be available for use from home, in the field, and from other out-of-office locations.

- Competent technical and policy/procedure support, operating as a "help desk" facility.

- Capability for file transfer protocol (FTP) data exchange.

- Secure e-mail for messaging and transmission of document attachments.

- "Intranet" features for organizational web sites, which may include search engines, archives, and any number of electronic resources at various sites.

- Online access to comprehensive legal research resources, such as Westlaw or Lexis

- Availability of newsgroups and other forums for exchange of information among the courts and other judicial entities. Eventually, these features will be extended to prosecutors, probation offices, juvenile facilities, and the like.

- Online forms fill, similar to the Adobe Acrobat forms provided by Indiana Secretary of State for corporate registrations. Principal uses will be for statistical reports and other forms-based reports promulgated by Division of State Court Administration, for use when direct data transfer of such reports is not feasible.

2. Means of Satisfying Network Requirements:

At this point, no decision has been made as to how the network requirements will be satisfied. However, several issues and considerations in this decision have been identified.

First, it is desirable to explore the feasibility of a sharing a full-service network facility, enlisting other compatible applications and offices to aggregate cost-effective usage. Assembling several compatible user offices at the local level will help justify robust communications service to all county judicial complexes, whether traditional county courthouses, more modern judicial centers, distributed judicial offices joined by county-provided local area networks, or other operational sites, such as hearing rooms and courtrooms in jail complexes.

Second, discussion with the Intelenet Commission suggests that a greater concentration of users will help substantiate the connectivity need and justify higher bandwidth service. Some examples of compatible users and uses include:

- The AIMS Project described in this document, which links the county trial courts with the Division of State Court Administration for forwarding of statistical and case data to a central repository and makes offices and resources more available to the courts and related offices at the county level.

- The Indiana Election Division (IED) of the Secretary of State, requiring connectivity with the county clerks and election boards in each Indiana county for exchange and synchronization of voter registration data. The requirement is for frequent database synchronization between county-maintained records and central site statewide records, online inquiry to a central IED repository, administrative communications throughout the state, and access to web sites of the state agencies and related groups such as Association of Indiana Counties, Clerk's association, etc.

- The State's prosecuting attorneys in each county, who require more effective networking for best use of the ProsLink computer system that is used in a majority of Indiana counties. The ProsLink system is a multilevel structure with local processing and synchronization with a central state database housed at the Indiana Prosecuting Attorneys Council. It includes e-mail communication and searching of data resources statewide.

- The CATS application (court abstracts transmission system) to enable court clerks to forward SR16 abstract-of-judgment form data and perhaps DWI probable cause affidavits to Bureau of Motor Vehicles.

- Forwarding by court clerks of court dispositions of felony and A misdemeanor cases to the Indiana State Police Criminal Justice Data Division central databases.

Third, it appears that sharing a network with the clerks' election board functions and with the prosecutors may be quite feasible, as the courts, clerks' election board functions, and prosecutors have certain common characteristics:

- They are physically located in or adjacent to the main courthouse facility in smaller counties and probably linked with internal local area networking in larger counties.

- Similar levels of security required – not as stringent as, for instance, the IDACS system sponsored by the Indiana State Police, but more secure than, for instance, the Purdue extension service network.

- The same kinds of online services are needed: file transfer/synchronization, online data access from central databases, access to internal web sites, e-mail with attachments, links to related entities.

Fourth, recent discussions indicate that the means of connectivity to satisfy the general requirements set out above may well be provided through the Indiana Intelenet Commission. Intelenet provides T1 and leased line service to public users across the state through a communications structure denominated the "Access Indiana State Backbone" ("AISB"). Intelenet acts as a manager and outsourcer, contracting for network facilities and services with AT&T and Ameritech. The Indiana Higher Education Telecommunications System (IHETS) handles network operations center management. The Access Indiana State Backbone is an ATM (asynchronous transfer mode) network with T3 transmission links using Cisco Systems switching equipment. The backbone is intended to support voice, video, and data traffic, including VPN (virtual private network) service for specific applications. Intelenet presently is providing support for web site facilities in many counties through its INDICO arm (Indiana Digital County Network).

Intelenet subsidizes the costs of network facilities to some extent through revenue generated from commercial users of access to data such as the Bureau of Motor Vehicles driver history databases. Intelenet is motivated to assist in providing network service to county-level offices. Discussions are underway to explore requirements, services, costs, and funding sources.

3. Progression of Statewide Network Infrastructure Implementation:

The Division of State Court Administration will be the lead agency in introducing full-time network services to courts and associated county offices and agencies. The networking initiative will be supported by the Indiana Intelenet Commission. It likely will proceed in two stages:

a. Stage One: Internet Access:

- Provision of high-speed Internet access to the courts and clerks in all counties.

- Enablement of FTP (file transfer protocol) data transmission for batch data upload/download.

- Access to web site resources in State Court Administration and elsewhere.

Stage One technically could support interactive central database inquiry and research via remote Internet access using "thin client" technology, but performance likely would be unsatisfactory. The FTP capability will at least make it feasible and reliable to upload data to the Division of State Court Administration, provided that the counties have at least one Internet capable PC. Under the auspices of J-TAC, Stage One is currently being implemented.

b. Stage Two: Intranet/Virtual Private Network ("VPN") Access. The Indiana Intelenet Commission is well positioned to provide such service through existing and expanded telecommunications facilities and services. Such access could:

- Add private networking for data transmission between county sites and the central State Court Administration facility.
- Enable online transaction processing for database inquiry and research, with excellent responsiveness and the ability to execute various central-site software applications on the main judicial databases.
- Enable live video conferencing, whiteboard sessions, and the like.
- Support the ancillary users, e.g., BMV, CATS, ISP records transmissions (including imaging), ProsLink Prosecutor's statewide system and Indiana Election Division voter registration with database search and update.
- Provide safe and secure access to the general public.
- Generally provide secured network computing for all authorized users.

The network environment is also intended to support an improved ongoing dialogue among the extended judicial community, including State Court Administration, the trial courts, software and services vendors, the Indiana State Police, Bureau of Motor Vehicles, Prosecuting Attorneys, County Clerks, the Judicial Center, the law schools, and others.

Stage Two will provide the full infrastructure sufficient for implementation of all AIMS capabilities.

D. Central Judicial Data Repository or "Warehouse"

Data downloaded from the county-level trial courts will be processed and stored in a central data repository or "warehouse" for the following purposes:

- Summary statistical tabulation.
- Management analysis purposes.
- Academic research.
- To serve as a reference source for the high courts of the state.

The recording of data in the central repository will be through a process of normalization of the data to conform with the data base schema and coding conventions. As data is accepted

for processing into the database, it will be transformed or "scrubbed" as necessary from its native form and coded into the standard form of the central repository.

This facility or data warehouse must be composed of certain essential elements, many of which will be outsourced to information technology professionals:

- An enterprise-strength database management system, tuned to alphanumeric data, with little initial requirement for object data of other types (image, sound, streaming video). Examples: IBM DB2, Informix, SQL Server, Sybase, Oracle.

- A communications server facility to deal with the incoming data updates and with the outgoing reports and data requests.

- A web server facility to support internal web site processing.

- Desirably, newsgroup forums and list serve processing to maintain an ongoing dialog among all members of the Indiana judicial community. Instant messaging and/or IRC type chat may be supported if demand warrants.

- The availability of the facility must be matched with strong technical and user support capability provided in several ways:

    - Online messaging to the "help desk" with e-mail response.

    - Toll-free voice contact with technical assistance when warranted.

    - FAQ web pages to satisfy regularly asked questions, including clickable e-mail response messages for common problems.

- Access to policy level support dealing with administrative rules, trial rules, and other official policies of the Indiana Supreme Court, through Division of State Court Administration.

- Coordination with Intelenet for access to public Internet and to Intelenet virtual private networking with counties and other judicial sites.

- Establishment of security procedures.

- Detail design and implementation of the data repository using the RDBMS, including edits, tables, codes, etc.

- Preparation of report formats and other presentations of data.

- Provision of full search/find and ad hoc report generation and statistical analysis procedures.

E. Funding the AIMS Project

The Supreme Court believes that implementing the AIMS Project will provide significant benefits to courts and court clerks, to others who use court information, and to the general public we serve. ***Whether or not AIMS is implemented as contemplated by this budget request, there will be substantial public expenditures for trial court and court clerk computerization during the next biennium.*** The key questions, then, are (1) whether those expenditures will be made in a coordinated fashion and (2) what level of government will make those expenditures.

Historically, each county government has financed its own trial court technology without reference to data exchange with users in other counties or at the state level. And while implementation of the AIMS project could be funded in the main by county government, the Supreme Court recommends substantial state-level funding for several reasons:

- By its nature, the critically necessary standardization and networking of the various computer systems is a centralized endeavor which has the greatest opportunity for cost efficiency and success when funding decisions are also centralized;

- If this process is left to counties and their individual budgets, it is unrealistic to expect the coordination of efforts and pooling of resources required to accomplish the critically needed result; and

- In the final analysis, while trial courts are located in the various counties, those courts do the judicial business of all of the people of Indiana and serve as the frontline of the judicial branch of Indiana state government.

Of course, alternative funding sources could be utilized. Counties could be required to pay some or all of the costs of upgrading or installing case management systems. A "technology surcharge" could be placed on certain filing fees to generate revenue for these projects. But regardless of the source of the funding, substantial court technology expenditures will be required in the next two years.

The Court's strategic plan for use of the requested funding is as follows:

First, existing case management systems (referred to as "legacy systems") will be kept in place where feasible and upgraded as necessary to meet AIMS standards. The Court recommends that the state pay for the upgrading of these legacy systems.

Second, new case management systems meeting AIMS standards will be purchased for counties without systems or for counties where existing systems cannot be upgraded to meet AIMS standards. The Court recommends that the state pay for installing these new systems.

Third, while there would be ongoing supervision of the county case management systems, primary maintenance responsibilities will by necessity remain at the county level. The Court recommends that the costs of support and routine maintenance of the county systems continue to be the responsibility of the counties.

Fourth, as the counties' case management systems are developed, the central judicial data repository or warehouse will be built and ready for secure use as the county systems come "online".

Summary of Part I Funding Requested

	FY2002	FY2003	TOTAL
Implementing the AIMS Project			
New case management system installations	2,228,983	2,926,339	5,155,322
Data warehouse and interface development	965,652	2,144,477	3,110,129
High-speed statewide internet connections	410,000	610,000	1,020,000
Public access and information	200,168	217,864	418,032
Access to online legal research resources	301,000	500,000	801,000
Education, training, and office expense	126,600	151,300	277,900
Subtotal	**4,232,403**	**6,549,980**	**10,782,383**

Part II. Exploring Important Innovations in Court Technology

The Supreme Court seeks $ 1.04 million in aggregate funding during the FY 2001-2003 biennium to support pilot projects in a variety of useful and innovative court technologies. These efforts would include:

A. Pilot Projects in "Paperless Courts."

We are moving from an age of paper to an age of electronically stored information. Courts must be part of that movement in order to responsibly serve the public. Electronic filing systems have the potential to reduce the use of paper by everyone who interacts with the courts. Indiana attorneys and state and local agencies that appear regularly before the courts are especially likely to take advantage of an electronic filing system, either submitting filings on diskettes or transmitting them electronically.

Accordingly, the Supreme Court requests that five pilot projects be established and funded to explore the feasibility of paperless courts in which all filings, notices, and other items now written are instead created, transmitted, used, and stored electronically, at an aggregate cost of $75,000 in FY 2002 and $165,000 in FY 2003 of the biennium.

B. Pilot Projects in "Video Courts."

Interactive video technology offers increased efficiency, access, convenience, and cost reduction in judicial proceedings and administrative functions. This technology holds the promise of significantly reducing the cost of making courtroom appearances and significantly improving the courts' ability to handle the increasing torrent of litigation. Because of these and other advantages, the ultimate goal should be to make maximum use of video technology and telepresence to the extent permitted by law and consistent with the purposes of the judicial branch.

It is clear, however, that video technology has the potential to fundamentally alter the courtroom experience and the delivery of justice. Experts familiar with civil, criminal, trial, and appellate law need to evaluate the effects of telepresence on the judicial process and make recommendations on its appropriate use and on how to mitigate any adverse effects.

Accordingly, the Supreme Court requests that five pilot projects be established and funded to explore the feasibility of video courts in which individuals can participate in proceedings from remote locations at an aggregate cost of $40,000 in FY 2002 and $160,000 in FY 2003 of the biennium.

C. Pilot Projects in Voice Recognition Technology

Creating court records – both discrete entries of developments in proceedings and actual transcripts of proceedings – is enormously labor-intensive. Recent advances in voice recognition technology hold promise of reducing both the cost of creating such records and the tedium of doing so.

Accordingly, the Supreme Court requests that five pilot projects be established to explore the feasibility of implementing voice recognition technology as a method of keeping court records, at an aggregate cost of $40,000 in FY 2002 and $160,000 in FY 2003 of the biennium .

D. Court Technology Innovation Contingency Fund

Technological advances not dreamed of today will emerge during the next biennium. Accordingly, the Supreme Court requests that a modest contingency fund be established to support pilot projects in emerging innovative court technologies during the upcoming biennium, at an aggregate cost of $160,000 in FY 2002 and $240,000 in FY 2003 of the biennium.

Summary of Part II Funding Requested

	FY2002	FY2003	TOTAL
Exploring Emerging Court Information Technology			
Paperless Courts	75,000	165,000	240,000
Video Courts	40,000	160,000	200,000
Voice Recognition	40,000	160,000	200,000
Contingency Fund for Emerging Technology	160,000	240,000	400,000
Total	**315,000**	**725,000**	**1,040,000**